

AN ANALYSIS OF THE U.S. BUREAU OF PRISONS
MANAGERIAL/ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT
FOR ITS EEO PROGRAM

A DEGREE PAPER
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF ATLANTA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

BY
TALITHA RENEE WILLIS

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

JULY 1981

Rii P-46

ABSTRACT

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

WILLIS, TALITHA RENEE B.A., Spelman College, 1979

An Analysis of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons Managerial/
Administrative Support for Its EEO Program

Adviser: Dr. Keith Simmonds

A Degree Paper dated July 8, 1981

The primary intent of this paper is to analyze managerial/administrative support for the Equal Employment Opportunity Program in the U.S. Bureau of Prisons. The analysis involves the examination of three problem areas in the Equal Employment Opportunity Program.

The problem areas are identified as a lack of resources, a lack of personnel, and a lack of enthusiasm among employees for the program. The evaluation of these problem areas gives insight to the support obtained from management.

Recommendations for improving these problem areas follow the analysis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction	1
Focus	
Analytical Approach	
Historical Perspective	
Methodology	
II. Setting and Internship	12
III. An Analysis of Administrative Operations	14
IV. An Analysis of The Problem Areas	27
V. Recommendations/Conclusion	37

I. INTRODUCTION

When management does not support the organization's objectives, the organization may fail to attain established goals or accomplish intended results. Not only does this weaken the effectiveness of the organization, it could also set the framework for substantial apathy among employees. The overall purpose of this paper is to discuss the importance of managerial/administrative support for, and commitment to, established programs in an agency, specifically, the EEO Program in the U.S. Bureau of Prisons, Atlanta, Georgia.

Focus

The focus of this paper is a discussion on an organizational problem which the writer identified during her internship with the Bureau of Prisons Personnel/Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Office. The problem was discovered as a result of the intern's examination of EEO goals and objectives of the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) which indicated that there was a need for managerial support. In this paper, the plans of the Bureau of Prisons will be analyzed to determine whether EEO program goals were accomplished through commitment from management.

In compliance with federal regulations which stipulate that each agency in the federal government is responsible for developing an agency-wide and regional equal employment opportunity plan, the Bureau of Prisons made provisions in its organization for the establishment of EEO Offices in its five regional offices. These plans were to embody the concept of equal employment opportunity, which prohibits discrimination in employment because of race, sex, color, religion, national origin, age, or handicap. It also seeks to promote the full realization of EEO through a continuing affirmative action program to overcome the efforts of past and present discrimination.

Analytical Approach

Three problem areas of the BOP's EEO Program are analyzed in this paper to determine management's role in terms of support and commitment. After the introduction, comes the setting and internship. The next section is an analysis of the method of operations in the agency. This is followed by an identification and analysis of the three problem areas. The final section offers recommendations for the three problem areas.

Historical Perspective

Affirmative action has raised a substantial amount of controversy in recent years. The term means different things to different people, but to many, it is construed to mean the application of goals and quotas to be used to secure

preference in the hiring of minorities and women. Heated political arguments have arisen as a result of such perceptions, but for the purpose of this paper, the following definition is offered as an operational definition.

Affirmative action is the implementation of special efforts to employ and advance minorities and women in order to overcome the effects of past and present discrimination.¹

In the past twenty years, EEO has become a major concern of public personnel administration in this country. Many statutes, executive orders, judicial decisions, and administrative regulations are aimed at enhancing EEO at all levels of government. Because of the varied connotations of EEO, specifically in terms of how it should be defined and implemented, affirmative action has become a major political controversy in the American society today. The political debate has significantly affected public administration. It is necessary to have some understanding of the discriminatory practices of the past to understand recent EEO developments. Although other groups have been subjected to discriminatory practices, discrimination against blacks and women has been most prevalent.

Even as the American Revolutionaries were fighting the British for the right to establish a new political

¹ Federal Personnel Manual 271, Subchapter 4, Nature and Use of Personnel Measurement Methods, July, 1969. p. 68.

order, it was reasonably clear that whatever improvements the struggle for independence might bring to whites in the new world, blacks were not very likely to receive a substantial share of the prospective benefits. This was demonstrated at the outset by General Washington, who, although in need of increased manpower was unwilling to utilize black troops. The issue of slavery aside, the first formal application of such an outlook toward free blacks came in 1810 when Congress enacted a law providing that no other than a free white person shall be employed in conveying the mail.² The law was subsequently modified, but it remained on the books until it was repealed in 1865.

Although this provision applied only to postal employees, it is believed that there were no blacks in the federal bureaucracy until 1867.³ After that date, blacks made slow but steady progress. By 1928, blacks had achieved a proportion in the federal service roughly equal to their proportion in the federal service roughly equal to their proportion in the nation as a whole. Politically, after the end of the Reconstruction Period, the Republicans began to make a number of black civil service appointments

²Personnel Management Series No. 1026, Expanding Opportunities in the Federal Government, March 1977, p. 93.

³Ibid.

as a form of compensation to the black race as a whole. Eventually, the appointment of blacks to some minor posts in black nations, such as Liberia and Haiti, become commonplace. However, once white southerners were able to disenfranchise blacks through terror, poll taxes, and other devices, the Republicans began to lose interest in blacks and became reluctant to make additional black appointments.⁴

During the latter part of the nineteenth century, as black gains under Reconstruction were significantly wiped out, it appeared that the merit system might offer a lasting means of facilitating their appointment to the federal service. In 1883, when the merit system was enacted into law, there were 620 blacks in the bureaucracy in Washington, D.C. By 1892, this number had increased to 2,393.⁵ In its Eighth Annual Report, the U.S. Civil Service Commission observed:

Another excellent feature of the examinations in the southern states has been the elimination not only of the questions of politics and religion, but of the question of race. It maintained that it is impossible to overestimate the boon to these colored men and women of being given the chance to enter the government service on their own merits in fair competition with white and colored alike.

6

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid., p. 94.

At times, maintaining entry was more difficult than gaining entry. The civil service laws did little to prevent discrimination in dismissals and in other aspects of personnel administration. Thus, in 1894, Civil Service Commissioner Theodore Roosevelt observed that there were dismissals of about two-thirds of the blacks in the War Department, over the three or four preceding years. A decade later, President Taft believed that blacks should not hold Federal posts where whites complained of their presence.⁷ He also encouraged segregationist practices in the Federal service by segregating census takers in Washington, restricting whites to white neighborhoods and blacks to black neighborhoods.⁸

During the Wilson administration, there was a large dismissal of black employees. Discriminatory practices continued and were sanctioned by the United States Civil Service Commission. In the words of one of its officials, "the Commission had the practice of not certifying Negroes to bureaus where they would not be welcome."⁹ It was not until the New Deal that the treatment of blacks in the Federal service began to change.

Women in the public sector have generally not been treated as equals in the Federal service. As with blacks,

⁷Federal Personnel Manual 410, Training in Support of Upward Mobility Programs, June 1974, p. 23.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid.

discrimination against women was once formally sanctioned both by law and official directive. Ironically, the most important formal basis of inequality on the grounds of sex was derived from an 1870 statute that was intended to give women greater equality: "Women may, in the discretion of the head of any department, be appointed to any of the clerkships therein authorized by law, upon the same requisites and conditions, and with the same compensations as are prescribed for men."¹⁰ This law was interpreted as allowing appointing officers to exclude women for reasons unrelated to their capacity or the efficiency of the service, and until 1919, women were excluded from about 60% of the civil service exams. Unequal compensation had originally been provided for by law and despite the 1879 statute, it continued in some agencies until 1923 when the Classification Act established the requirement of equal pay for equal work, regardless of sex.¹¹

Historically, both blacks and women have been confined to lower grades. Both groups have found it somewhat easier to obtain positions in clerical and janitorial types of work. Until the 1960's, the U.S. Civil Service Commission formally supported women and blacks while at the same time accepting

¹⁰Ibid., p. 24.

¹¹Civil Service Commission Bulletin 410-83, Equal Employment Opportunity in the Federal Government, Jan. 1979, p. 53.

and even abetting discrimination against them.

Although there were a few earlier provisions designed to promote equal opportunity in the public sector, it was not until 1941 that a serious EEO effort began. Beginning with President Roosevelt in 1941, there have been executive orders issued with the intent of eliminating discrimination in the Federal government. Executive Order 8587, issued by Roosevelt, stated that public employment could not be denied for reasons of race, creed, or color.¹² The orders issued after Roosevelt's order established various boards and committees to eliminate discrimination in Federal employment. However, at this time, the program remained passive. Agencies were told what they could not do rather than what they should or must do.

In 1955, President Eisenhower issued Executive Order 10950 which required that equal opportunity be afforded to all qualified persons. The concept of affirmative action was introduced in 1961 with President Kennedy's Executive Order 10925. This order directed positive measures for the elimination of any discrimination direct or indirect. In addition, agencies were directed to eliminate existing practice that treated individuals differently because of their race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.¹³

¹²Ibid.

¹³Ibid.

Present EEO laws and executive orders in existence include: The Civil Rights Act of 1964 established the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and Title VII of that Act, enables the Commission to prosecute cases of discrimination in Federal agencies; President Johnson's Executive Order 11246 in 1965 brought significant change by placing responsibility for government wide guidance and leadership under the Civil Service Commission. For the first time, EEO became a part of the mainstream of Federal personnel administration.¹⁴ The order was amended in 1967, extending coverage to discrimination based on sex; Executive Order 11478 issued in 1969, made clear for the first time that EEO applies to and must be an integral part of every aspect of personnel policy and practices in the employment, development, advancement, and treatment of civilian employees of the Federal government.¹⁵ It also emphasized upward mobility so that underutilized employees with ability to advance could receive training and experience that would help them to compete for more responsible jobs. The EEO Act of 1972 extended coverage of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to Federal, state, and local governments.¹⁶ This law protects against discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin. The Rehabilitation Act, Section 501,

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Federal Personnel Management Supplement 990-1, Executive Order 11478, September 1979, p. 107.

¹⁶Ibid.

encourages the hiring of the handicapped in state and local governments; The Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 contains antidiscrimination clauses regarding political affiliation, race, color, religion, national origin, sex, marital status, age, or handicap condition.

Methodology

The method of evaluative research is used in this paper. This method was chosen in order to examine the managerial/administrative support for the EEO Program. As proposed by Charles Wright, four categories of criteria according to which the success (support) or failure (lack of support) of a program may be evaluated were used. These are: effort, which asks what was done and how well was it done; performance, which measures the result of effort rather than the effort itself; adequacy of performance, which refers to the degree to which effective performance is adequate to the total amount of need; and process, which asks how and why a program works or does not work.¹⁷ Furthermore, successful performance implies successful effort, although such performance may still be inadequate in terms of the total problem being attacked, or inefficient as compared to some alternative method.¹⁸

¹⁷Edward Suchman, Evaluative Research (New York: Russell-Sage Foundation, 1967), p. 61.

¹⁸Ibid.

The research methods utilized included personal and telephone interviews with BOP personnel, participant observation, and an examination of agency documents and records. To obtain a sample response from the employees, closed questionnaires were also used. A closed or fixed question is one in which the responses of the subject are limited to stated alternatives.¹⁹ These alternatives may be simply "yes" or "no" or they may provide for indicating various degrees of approval or agreement.²⁰

The questionnaires were distributed to 350 BOP employees. One hundred and twenty (120) questionnaires were returned. (See Appendix for questionnaire.)

The data from these sources will be used to determine the impact of EEO actions and directives on program goals and direct attention to problem areas.

¹⁹Claire Selltitz, Research Methods in Social Relations, (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1976), p. 310.

²⁰Ibid.

II. SETTING AND INTERNSHIP

The Federal Prisons System is a division of the Department of Justice. The administration of the Federal Prison System is carried out by four divisions and five regional offices or bureaus. The mission of the Federal Bureau of Prisons is to protect society by implementing the judgments of the Federal Courts, and to provide offenders with opportunities for self-improvement through education, vocational training, counseling, and similar programs.

The Southeast Regional Personnel/EEO Office, Atlanta, of the BOP served as the setting for the writer's internship. This office coordinated and supervised all activities pertaining to personnel and EEO in the ten institutions within the Southeast Region.

As an EEO assistant to the Regional EEO Specialist, the writer was assigned various tasks in order to obtain a broad knowledge of the EEO Program. These tasks included preparing regional and statistical EEO reports, compiling data for activity reports, and preparing EEO/Personnel Conference reports.

The writer was also given training in personnel actions to gain direct experience with the mission

and structure of federal personnel policies and practices. This experience included job exposure to staffing, position classification, and labor-management relations. The writer also observed agency functions which gave her a valuable insight into the organizational structure of the federal government.

III. AN ANALYSIS OF ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

As stated earlier, each Federal agency must abide by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Executive Orders 11246 and 11478, the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, and the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 in order to fully incorporate an EEO Program into its organization. At the Southeast Regional Office of the Bureau of Prisons, this responsibility was delegated to the Personnel/EEO Office. The specific function of the EEO Office, which consists of only the Regional EEO Specialist, is to provide staff assistance to the Regional Director and the Regional Personnel Officer in all aspects of the EEO Program. The purpose of the Southeast Region's EEO Program is to insure that all persons are treated without regard to race, sex, color, national origin, age, or physical handicap as prescribed by Federal law. The program includes, but not limited to, hiring, retention, upward mobility, promotion, training, and the establishing of a total EEO Program.

The concerns of EEO matters in the Southeast Region fall into three categories: (1) Development of the Affirmative Action Plan (2) Recruitment (3) Establishment of Better Communications between employees and EEO

Committees. The affirmative action plan for the Federal Prison System states that, "Each institution and head-quarter should establish an EEO Committee to advise the head of the institution on concerns of EEO matters and to assist in the development of the institutional Action Plan."²¹

The EEO Committees serve as advisors to management regarding women and minority concerns. The committee also develops and monitors the affirmative action plan and sponsors special programs relating to equal employment opportunity for employees. The affirmative action plans for the institutions encompass the following eight areas: (1) Organization and resources (2) Discrimination complaints (3) Recruitment (4) Full utilization of skills and training (5) Upward mobility (6) Supervisory and management commitment (7) Community outreach (8) Program outreach.²²

The EEO Committee in each institution consists of one of the associate wardens or a representative, special emphasis program coordinators, EEO recruiters, EEO representatives, and EEO counselors. The associate wardens are included to help ensure management's awareness of EEO affairs. EEO recruiters are useful to the committee in their assistance with the writing

²¹Personnel Management Pamphlet Series No. 1024, Guideline for Agency Internal Evaluation of EEO Programs, Oct. 1979, p. 79.

²²Ibid.

of the affirmative action plan and advising the committee on recruitment. EEO representatives voice concerns of employees at the meetings. EEO Counselors provide input on problem areas discovered while counseling and advise management on these areas through the committee. All members of the committee, with the exception of the associate warden, are appointed to these positions by supervisors and top management officials.

In compliance with EEO standards, it is necessary for each institution to lay out specific goals and objectives in the form of an institutional affirmative action plan. These goals and objectives are to include the special emphasis programs which are usually the core of most institutions' affirmative action programs. These programs include the Federal Women's Program, the Black Affairs Program, the Asian/Pacific American/Indian Program, and the Federal Equal Opportunity Program.

The Federal Women's Program (FWP) is a special emphasis program within the EEO Program designed to address issues pertaining to equal opportunity for women. It was made a part of the EEO Program because it is believed that equal employment opportunity for women can be best obtained by integrating it with the agency's overall EEO Program. The Federal Women's Program seeks to concentrate on three major areas:

- (1) Upgrading current employees
- (2) Recruitment of women in all career fields
- (3) Development of activities and

programs in areas of concern to women. It is the responsibility of the Regional EEO Specialist to monitor the activities of this program in the ten institutions. The Regional EEO Specialist's function is to advise management on the activities and needs of the program and provide guidance to employees, supervisors, and FWP coordinators in the ten institutions and the regional office.

The Black Affairs Program in the Bureau of Prisons is different from the other special emphasis programs in that it is one of the few programs in the public sector to specifically address the concerns of black employees through affirmative action. As in the Federal Women's Program, the Regional EEO Specialist has the responsibility for advising management on the activities and needs of the program and providing guidance where needed.

The Hispanic Employment Program is another special emphasis program that was created to examine problems that hamper Hispanics from obtaining employment. The program examines issues such as Hispanic demographics, stereotypes, attitudes of the majority community, and the role of managers in key institutions that serve

Hispanics. The Regional EEO Specialist is also responsible for this program.

The Selective Placement Program is concerned with the hiring, placement, and advancement of handicapped individuals in the public sector who become disabled for the positions they hold but may qualify for others or through rehabilitation may be able to develop abilities needed to continue in their former jobs. The main objective is full and fair consideration of persons with disabilities. The emphasis is placed on what they can do as opposed to what they cannot do. The program emphasizes abilities and skills applicable to employment.

The most recent and smallest special emphasis program is the Asian/Pacific American/Indian Program. This program is the smallest because these persons are the smallest minority group in the public sector. The program has as its objectives: (1) Recruitment of Asian/Pacific American/Indian persons in all career fields and (2) Encourage officials to take appropriate actions.

The Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program is one that was mandated by the Office of Personnel Management. The program requires agencies to develop

recruitment programs that will eliminate the underrepresentation of minorities and women. The regulations require each agency to make underrepresentation determinations for each category of employment and for each grade or grade grouping in each category of employment. These occupations are known as professional, administrative, clerical, and other jobs. This determination is based on civilian labor force data. This program is also monitored by the Regional EEO Specialist.

Affirmative action plans in the institutions are to be written and reviewed annually and a copy of these plans sent to the Regional EEO Office. Progress and activity reports give the amount of time, if any, spent on special emphasis programs, recruiting, counseling, and any other activities pertaining to equal employment opportunity. From these reports, the Regional EEO Specialist formulates quarterly EEO reports which are forwarded to the regional director. These activity reports serve as indicators to the Regional EEO Specialist and management as to the problems and needs of the EEO Program.

The activity reports also alert management as to the effectiveness of the EEO plan of each institution as to whether or not it is a living assessment of real problems and identification of positive programs to tackle those problems. The activity reports for the region have indicated that there is not much time being spent on EEO in the ten institutions. The EEO Program cannot be effective if there is little or no time spent pursuing its goals or objectives.

Reasons given on the activity reports for little or no time spent on EEO were non-attendance at meetings by EEO Committee members, directive from wardens or associate wardens to minimize time spent on EEO, and a lack of interest among employees.

In determining whether management has taken significant steps to put an affirmative action program into effect, the reasons stated for the lack of activity on the activity reports will be analyzed. These reasons will give an insight into how the EEO program works at the ten institutions. The basic approach to EEO evaluation involves two separate, but closely related objectives:

First, to eliminate any practice or patterns of discrimination, intentional or unintentional. Any patterns or actions and individual policies or procedures which tend to discriminate against any segments of the population, whether these practices are motivated by entirely different considerations must be carefully exposed. Lack of intention to discriminate does not make any more acceptable the reality of procedures, practices, or actions that in fact do discriminate.

Second, to make sure that the organization in question is directly committed to affirmative action and has taken vigorous steps to put an affirmative action program into effect. This means that the planning that has been done must be analyzed and it must also be determined whether the resources have been committed to make the plans work, whether the actions to which the agency is committed have in fact been taken, whether the results of these actions have been observed and whether this information has been used as a basis for assessing progress, revising and updating plans, and determining the need for new or stronger actions.

23

Non-attendance at EEO Committee meetings was the most prevalent reason for lack of activity on the activity reports. One of the reasons given for nonattendance by committee members was that due to the small amount of money appropriated for the program, committee members felt that they had nothing to work with. Members felt that most of the worthwhile attempts to implement the program could not be realized due to financial reasons. Committee members also expressed concern over their lack of training. When training for EEO was offered, many committee members were denied the opportunity to attend by the associate warden who approves or disapproves all requests for training in the institutions. Training was denied due to a lack of funds; however, according to the

²³Civil Service Commission Bulletin 410-84,
Equal Employment Digest, January, 1979, p.72.

Regional EEO Specialist, funds were found for other training programs such as staff training and disturbance control, safety, and institutional familiarization.

Several committee members also expressed concern over the attitude of the associate wardens, wardens, and management in general. Many incidents were cited where committee members, who are only part-time EEO personnel, were directed to decrease the minimal time they were already spending on EEO to carry out their duties. As a result, many felt that their hands were tied and that to "disobey" any directives would be detrimental to their careers. Some institutions even reported that the appointed top management official did not attend the EEO Committee meetings, did not send a representative, and neither encouraged others to attend. This is indicated in the activity reports on the following pages which show the amount of time spent on various EEO activities. Tables 1, 2, and 3 are activity reports from the Federal Women's Program, Black Affairs Program, and Hispanics Program.

These tables clearly show that there is an attitude of general apathy among the institutions as far as the EEO Program is concerned. For instance, during this period only 69 working days were spent on the three special emphasis programs combined in the ten institutions from July, 1979, to June, 1980. This is a period of less than three months over an eleven month time frame. Time periods for each program show sixteen working days spent on the

Table 1

S.E. Region E.E.O. Report of Activities

Federal Women's Program

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Time Spent on Counseling</u>	<u>Time Spent Recruiting</u>	<u>Time Spent on Meetings</u>	<u>Time Spent on Training</u>	<u>Time Spent on Other</u>
Ashland	0	1	2	44.5	13
Atlanta	0	0	0	0	0
Butner	2	1	28.5	8	13
Eglin	1	0	6	0	0
Lexington	0	0	2	0	0
Miami	0	0	0	0	0
Memphis	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	0	0	0	0	0
Tallahassee	0	0	7	0	0

*Time is measured by the hour.

Several institutions participated in special activities in the Federal Women's Program. The institution in Ashland sponsored workshops on "Stress Management" and "Hostage Situations." In Butner, an Awareness Workshop was held where employees became familiar with the rules, regulations, and programs available in the Federal Women's Program. In career interest to the employees, a presentation was given at Eglin on "How To and How Not To Fill Out a Standard Form 171."

Table 2

S.E. Region E.E.O. Report of Activities

B.A.P.C.

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Time Spent on Counselling</u>	<u>Time Spent Recruiting</u>	<u>Time Spent on Meetings</u>	<u>Time Spent on Training</u>	<u>Time Spent on Other</u>
Ashland	0	0	0	0	0
Atlanta	0	0	0	0	0
Butner	0	0	0	0	0
Eglin	4	6	1	0	0
Lexington	0	0	1.5	0	0
Miami	0	0	0	0	0
Memphis	33	0	45	24	62
Montgomery	0	0	0	0	5
Tallahassee	0	0	6	0	0

*Time is measured by the hour.

The Black Affairs Program has been very active in Memphis. Activities reported there include a Black-on-Black Crime Seminar and attendance to the National Association of Blacks in Criminal Justice Conference during April where a special workshop was conducted to acquaint Black Affairs Program Coordinators to their roles, duties, and responsibilities.

Table 3

S.E. Region EEO Report of Activities

H.E.P.C.

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Time Spent on Counselling</u>	<u>Time Spent Recruiting</u>	<u>Time Spent on Meetings</u>	<u>Time Spent on Training</u>	<u>Time Spent on Other</u>
Ashland	0	0	0	0	0
Atlanta	0	0	0	0	0
Butner	12	29	21.5	0	28
Eglin	0	13	6	0	0
Lexington	0	0	0	0	0
Miami	8.5	10	19	0	2
Memphis	18	9	7	1	0
Montgomery	0	0	0	0	0
Tallahassee	0	0	59.5	0	0

*Time is measured by the hour.

More activities have been reported in the Hispanics Program than any other program. This is due to the many H.E.P.C. meetings held in Tallahassee. The institution in Butner sponsored an Hispanic Heritage Week where several activities such as displays with Hispanic literature and films depicting the Hispanic Heritage in America were shown.

Federal Women's Program, thirty days for the Black Affairs Program, and twenty-three working days for the Hispanic Program. Clearly, employees are not spending much time on the EEO Program.

At the regional level, the Regional EEO Specialist is not allowed to attend the weekly staff meeting held at the Regional Office. At these meetings, each section's principal officer informs the director of any needs, problems, or concerns of his/her sections. The rationale for not allowing the Regional EEO Specialist to attend the meeting, even though she is the principal officer, is that the concerns of the EEO Program can be voiced through the Personnel Officer, who, however, is allowed to attend staff meetings. The EEO Office has special concerns of its own that need to be fully addressed by the person most familiar and responsible for these areas. This cannot be achieved if the Regional EEO Specialist is not included in the staff meetings.

The lack of interest displayed by management in its EEO Program has filtered down to the ranks of its employees who assumed the same attitude as management. As was evident in the high number of complaints received on management's inability to provide opportunities for employees to enhance their skills, management had not made sure that employees at all levels were aware of the EEO complaints procedure or of its position on the program.

IV. AN ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEM AREAS

The activity reports indicate that there are three problem areas concerning managerial/administrative support for the EEO Program. They indicate that (1) financial resources for the program are inadequate, (2) EEO personnel are insufficient, and (3) widespread apathy among employees exists towards the program. These areas will be analyzed to determine the level of commitment for the EEO Program; also, the study will provide insight into the day-to-day administration of EEO Program activities at the BOP.

Insufficient Funds

Financial resources for the EEO Program are very limited. Consequently, the lack of financial resources has led to inadequately trained personnel and a lack of recruiting. Eighty (80) per cent of the employees indicated by their responses on the questionnaire that financial commitment is viewed as being the greatest expression of administrative support given to a program. Without this tangible means of support, management is considered to be only "going through the motions."

The EEO Act of 1972 requires EEO action plans to include the allocation of personnel and resources.

The Act states that agencies must have sufficient resources assigned and organized to administer and carry out the program in an effective manner. An examination of the BOP's affirmative action plan shows that the plan does not specifically address the allocation of personnel and resources. It only mentions that an EEO Office has been designated to carry out the agency's EEO Program. A concise plan of how resources are to be allocated to the program is not included.

Budget resources for each division within the BOP are sent to the regional director once a year in the spring. These requests are reviewed by the regional director who submits the bureau's request to the Department of Justice by early summer. The regional director is then allocated a sum of money for the fiscal year. According to the Regional Personnel Officer, money is then distributed to each section according to priority.

The EEO Office does not send its budget requests to the regional director but to the personnel officer who incorporates the EEO budget within the personnel budget. During an interview with the regional personnel officer, he indicated that every effort would be made to give the EEO Program as much financial support as possible without infringing upon resources of the personnel office.

At a minimum, the EEO Program should include travel and per diem for EEO personnel, training expenses, and money for programs which will effectively enhance advancement and career development of women and minorities in the work force. The fact that the EEO Program does not have a definite source of funds greatly hampers the effectiveness of the program.

A program's resources define what it can and cannot do. The limited resources allocated for the EEO Program have defined it as a program that cannot do much. As a result, the program is regarded as being unessential to the overall goals of the agency.

It has already been established that the effectiveness of the EEO Program is stifled by its lack of funds. Management must give credibility and creditability to the program through budget resources of its own. If the EEO Program is to survive, it cannot be expected to rely on the mere pittance incorporated in the personnel budget. Separate budgets would help ensure the EEO Program of using its own resources to obtain desired program results that will impact upon the agency. Every effort should be made to increase the EEO budget. This budget could be used by management to provide information on those EEO areas that need attention or present themselves as pressing matters.

Insufficient Personnel

The EEO Office presently consists of only the Regional EEO Specialist. She is supported by the part-time EEO Committee members located throughout the ten institutions. However, these part-time EEO Committee members are not involved in the day-to-day activities of the EEO Program.

The Regional EEO Specialist does not report directly to the regional director but to the regional personnel officer. When time and necessity dictate, the Regional EEO Specialist receives assistance from the personnel office in carrying out her duties.

The Regional EEO Specialist is the principal resource person for affirmative action within the Southeast Region. As the principal EEO official, she is expected to participate in the program implementation of all the EEO specialty areas. The Regional EEO Specialist is expected to monitor the activities of EEO Counselors, special emphasis coordinators, and EEO Committees. She prepares staff reports, EEO assessments, participates in recruiting trips, compiles, evaluates, and analyzes data relative to the bureau's EEO Program. All of these duties remain the sole responsibility of the Regional EEO Specialist.

Responses from employees on the questionnaires strongly indicate a belief that more personnel are needed in the EEO Office. Seventy (70) per cent of the employees feel that they are being inadequately served in the EEO area.

During an interview, EEO Committee members from one institution also expressed the same sentiments. Committee members were worried that the objectives of each of the eight areas of their affirmative action plans could not be attained with an inadequate and part-time EEO staff.

Inadequate staff characterizes a low key commitment from management to the EEO Program. Commitment for the EEO Program, in part, must be reflected through the provision of an adequate staff. According to the Regional EEO Specialist, efforts to obtain more personnel for the EEO Office have proven futile. Although the EEO Program warrants an office, it is not adequately staffed as one.

Separating the EEO Office from the Personnel Office would help the program to become more visible and establish better communications in the bureau. A separation would mean additional staff for the EEO Office. Trained additional staff would better serve the EEO Program than one over-extended, full-time employee.

This separation is wholeheartedly supported by the regional personnel officer and the regional EEO Specialist. Since many of the complaints of employees stem from personnel actions, the personnel officer felt that a separation from the EEO Office would not place the EEO Office in a conflicting role concerning those cases. The Regional EEO Specialist felt that the EEO Program needed more staff because the program includes special areas that require specialized treatment from those who are specifically trained to work in this area.

Both officials agree that there is an indivisible relationship between good personnel management and equal employment opportunity. "The greater the knowledge of personnel management and skill in analyzing organizational practices, the greater the potential of success for the EEO Specialist. Personnel specialists, likewise, can gain by a stronger working knowledge of equal employment opportunity programs."²⁴ What they suggest is a cross-training for both offices instead of a combination of the two offices. While this position will reflect the broadened role of the EEO Specialist and emphasize the close relationship with personnel work, it will also show the need for additional staff in view of the expanding role of the EEO Specialist.

Low Morale Among Employees

Apathy among the employees is a serious problem for the EEO Program. The activity reports have indicated that time spent on EEO by management and the institutions is very limited. EEO Committee members indicated on the activity reports that they are reluctant to go against the wishes of their supervisors and wardens. These persons clearly imply that time spent on EEO matters is frowned upon and should not be encouraged. It appears that at every

²⁴Federal Personnel Manual 271, Subchapter 4, Nature and Use of Personnel Measurement Methods, July, 1969, p. 104.

level, management is not sufficiently aware of, nor does it correctly understand nor fully accept its role in EEO. EEO plans, and hence, establishment of goals continue to be developed primarily by EEO Committee members and personnel. This approach is not gaining the appropriate involvement of managers, wardens, and first level supervisors in setting and meeting goals. Consequently, their interest and commitment to affirmative action have left much to be desired and, in fact, seriously undermine the goals of the EEO Program. Indeed, management's lack of interest has filtered down to employees who believe that the EEO Program exists in name only.

The questionnaires revealed that 80 per cent of the employees felt that the agency administers an ineffective EEO Program. Sixty (60) per cent could not identify EEO officials in the institution or its agency. Forty-two (42) per cent of the employees who responded indicated that EEO activities were held during inconvenient hours, such as lunch or after work.

Ninety (90) per cent of the employees indicated by their responses that they showed no interest in the EEO program because they felt that the program was not designed or intended for all employees. Seventy-nine (79) per cent of the responses indicated that the employees felt that the EEO Program addresses the problems of minority and women employees and applicants. In contrast, only 21 per

cent of the responses indicate that the EEO Program addresses the problems of male employees and applicants.

According to the Regional Personnel Officer, management knows of its employees' low morale towards the EEO Program; however, management has not attempted to solve the problem because of its sensitive nature.

Many managers have expressed frustration regarding the apparent inconsistency between the policy of non-discrimination and the affirmative action programs. "How," they ask, "can we reconcile a policy of nondiscrimination and selection based on merit principles with affirmative action requirements?"²⁵ Managers can work their way out of this apparent dilemma if they clearly understand what affirmative action really is and how it relates to non-discrimination and merit principles.

As stated earlier, affirmative action is positive, continuing action to promote the full realization of equal employment opportunity. Affirmative action begins with an assessment of the organization's work force. If the assessment reveals that representation of minorities and women is below public policy objectives, then affirmative action must be taken to improve representation. In cases where women and minorities are underrepresented, managers must assure that all persons have an opportunity to compete on a fair and equal basis for selection into vacant positions and training programs.

²⁵Ibid.

Managers must be careful to avoid actions which give the impression that goals are quotas which must be met by violating merit principles. The 1971 Civil Service Guidelines make the following distinction between goals and quotas:

A goal is a realistic objective which an agency endeavors to achieve on a timely basis within the context of the merit system of employment. A quota on the other hand, would restrict employment or development opportunities to members of particular groups by establishing a required number of proportionate representation which agency managers are obligated to attain without regard to merit system requirements. 26

The establishment of goals and timetables can be usefully applied by management and should be done when such actions will contribute to the resolution of equal employment opportunity problems. The objective of affirmative action is equal opportunity to compete for promotions, training, etc. under the principles of merit.

Efforts to uplift employees' enthusiasm for the EEO Program can be established by a promotion of better communications and mutual respect between employees and management. More is needed than mere nondiscrimination and the prohibition of discriminatory practices. Management decisions must be motivated by relevant factors such as those related to the requirements of a job.

²⁶Civil Service Commission Bulletin 410-83,
Equal Employment Opportunity in the Federal Government,
January, 1979, p.99.

What is needed are strong affirmative actions to ensure that all persons have an opportunity to compete on a fair and equal basis for employment and advancement in the Federal government. Equal employment opportunity does not just happen; it comes about because managers make it happen.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS/CONCLUSION

The ultimate success of the EEO Program depends upon an effectively managed program. Such a program requires active management participation. This means that management must make a serious and strong commitment to the entire program. While the commitment may start with a policy statement that is disseminated widely by the regional director, it cannot end there. Commitment means budget; it means staff; it means making employees aware of the program. Employees are sensitive to the seriousness of that commitment and it will become credible as they learn of concrete measures taken.

The following recommendations are offered with the hope that, if implemented, they will enhance the EEO Program.

(1) To ensure an effective program, the bureau should allocate sufficient resources and establish a central point of coordination. One way to do this would be to designate a coordinator, preferably the regional director, and establish an EEO working group whose function would include planning, implementing, and monitoring program activities. The following persons might be included in this group:

(a) The Regional EEO Specialist and staff who would be responsible for a comprehensive EEO Affirmative Action Plan and program for the ten institutions in the BOP.

(b) Personnel Staffing Specialists who would analyze data essential to the identification of problems, target positions, job requirements, and elements of career ladders.

(c) Budget and Finance Staff whose knowledge of the budget process can assist planners in estimating and accounting for agency dollar resources.

(d) Counselors who are trained to provide initial and ongoing career counseling for all employees and are especially qualified to meet counseling needs of those at the lower grades.

(e) Wardens/Supervisors, within whose operational areas the EEO Program may make the greatest impact and whose knowledge of job elements will assist in shaping meaningful developmental experiences.

(f) Employee Representatives whose participation in planning can ensure an understanding of program goals and scope.

This group should meet at quarterly intervals to discuss the activity reports and pertinent EEO matters. Attendance by all members of the group to all meetings will be mandatory.

(2) The EEO Office should be allowed to add regional special emphasis coordinators to its staff. This would give the Regional EEO Specialist valuable assistance in attaining the eight areas of the affirmative action plan.

(3) Allow the Regional EEO Specialist to attend the weekly staff meeting to express the needs and concerns of the program and to solicit support and understanding from other managers and supervisors.

(4) Establish an annual EEO training program for all wardens, supervisors, and managers.

(5) All employees should be given an EEO briefing during new employee orientation. EEO workshops/briefings should be established for present employees to gain a better understanding of the program.

(6) Managers and supervisors should be required to complete an EEO activity report or checklist quarterly. These reports will be sent to division chiefs or higher and the managers and supervisors will be held accountable for these reports.

(7) Administrative leave and/or official time should be granted to interested employees to attend special EEO Program events.

(8) Publish EEO articles in the agency and institution's newspaper and bulletins.

(9) Establish EEO incentive awards for managers and supervisors for best EEO performance.

Conclusion

This demonstrated lack of managerial/administrative support is not a problem unique to the BOP. Other Federal agencies also have problems in getting managers and supervisors to support EEO goals. In the public sector, management is considered to be the key to a successful EEO Program. Since many selections for and promotions to positions are made by management's control of work assignments, training opportunities, and conducting performance appraisals, management has significant influence on the nature and degree of competition for entrance and promotion. If management is held fully accountable for its EEO performance, the program is more likely to succeed. With administrative support, the EEO Program can achieve its goals. Without this support, the program will utterly fail.

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questions are concerned with the Equal Employment Opportunity Program in your area. Please circle all answers that apply or include your own.

1. Do you know what the EEO Program is?
(a) Yes (b) No
 2. Does your organization have an EEO Office?
(a) Yes (b) No
 3. Have you seen your organization's EEO plan?
(a) Yes (b) No
 4. If yes, did you have any input?
(a) Yes (b) No
 5. Are there specific references and/or statements which indicate that: (a) Employees (b) Labor organizations (c) minorities (d) women (e) other interested parties were consulted for the EEO plan and their input considered? (Please circle all that apply.)
 6. Does the EEO Program address the problems of women employees and applicants? (a) Yes (b) No
 7. Does the EEO Program address the problems of minority employees and applicants? (a) Yes (b) No
 8. Does the EEO Program address the problems of male employees and applicants?
(a) Yes (b) No
 9. Do you know who your organization's EEO officials are?
(a) Yes (b) No
- Do you know who the Regional EEO Specialist is?
- (a) Yes (b) No
- Do you know who the Special Emphasis Program Coordinators are?
- (a) Yes (b) No

10. Have you had any contact with EEO officials?
(a) Yes (b) No
11. Have you been directly involved with any of these programs?
(a) Yes (b) No
12. How do you view the EEO Program?
(a) Effective
(b) Ineffective
(c) Just there in name only
(d) Exists for some employees only
(e) Other (Please indicate.) _____
-
13. Is there career advancement in your present position?
(a) Yes (b) No
14. If not, are there opportunities in your organization elsewhere to advance?
(a) Yes (b) No
15. Does your organization provide adequate career counseling?
(a) Yes (b) No
16. Do you know where you can go to find out information about jobs and career advancement?
(a) Yes (b) No
17. Does your organization have an upward mobility program?
(a) Yes (b) No
18. Have you ever participated in the upward mobility program?
(a) Yes (b) No
19. Is the training program adequate?
(a) Yes (b) No
20. Do you feel that women and minorities have the same opportunities for hiring, promotion, and training as other employees?
(a) Yes (b) No

21. Do you participate in special EEO activities?

- (a) Yes (b) No

22. If no, why?

- (a) Activities held during lunch
 (b) Activities held after work
 (c) Activities aren't designed for me
 (d) Activities aren't interesting
 (e) Can't get off work
 (f) Other (Please explain) _____
-

23. Does management support the EEO Program?

- (a) Yes (b) No

24. What do you view as the greatest means of support for the EEO Program?

- (a) Financial resources
 (b) More personnel
 (c) Reward and punishment for appropriate services
 (d) Other (Please explain.) _____
-

25. What suggestions do you have for the EEO Program?

- (a) More money
 (b) More personnel
 (c) More commitment from management
 (d) Separating EEO Office from personnel office
 (e) Other (Please explain.) _____
-

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, E.H. The Complex Problem of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.
- Baris, N.N. System Analysis for Effective Administration. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1971.
- Barnard, C.I. Organization and Management. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Civil Service Commission. Equal Employment Opportunity in the Federal Government. Civil Service Commission Bulletin 410-83. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979.
- Dale, E. Planning and Developing Organization Structure. New York: American Management Association, 1969.
- Dares, M.B. Relationship of Management Auditing to Decision Making. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
- Holden, Fish. Top Management Organization and Control. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Hyde, F.W. An Appraisal of Management. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1976.
- Jones, M.H. Executive Decision Making. Homewood: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1971.
- Office of Personnel Management. Nature and Use of Personnel Measurement Methods. Federal Personnel Manual 271, Subchapter 4. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.
- Office of Personnel Management. Training in Support of Upward Mobility Programs. Federal Personnel Manual 410. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.
- Office of Personnel Management. Executive Order 11478. Federal Personnel Management Supplement 990-1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.
- Office of Personnel Management. Guidelines for Agency Internal Evaluation of EEO Programs. Personnel Management Pamphlet Series No. 1024. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.
- Office of Personnel Management. Expanding Opportunities in the Federal Government. Personnel Management Series No. 1126. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.
- Office of Personnel Management. Outline of Action Areas and Suggested Elements for Inclusion in Agency EEO Plans of Action. Personnel Management Series No. 1026. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.
- Office of Personnel Management. Investigating Complaints of Discrimination in Federal Employment. Personnel Management Series No. 1700. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

- Office of Personnel Management. Processing Complaints of Discrimination. Personnel Management Series 1720. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.
- Office of Personnel Management. Study of Minority Group Employment in the Federal Government. Personnel Management Series 1755. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1979.
- Office of Personnel Management. Study of the Employment of Women in the Federal Government. Personnel Management Series 1757. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979.
- Roy, R.H. The Administrative Process. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1977.
- Scott, J.A. The Measurement of Management Efficiency. London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons. 1976.
- Sellitz, Claire. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1976.
- Weiss, Carol H. Evaluation Research. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1972.